

REMARKS

This response does attempt to introduce new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicant, respectfully, requests that this response be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated December 12, 2005 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application for invention.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-20 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,182,116 issued to Namma et al. (hereinafter referred to as Namma et al.).

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner states that Namma et al. disclose a peer distributed, embedded web server system accessing and controlling a multiplicity of devices as defined by rejected Claim 1. The Examiner's position is that Fig. 9, item 91 of Namma et al. disclose a master control device comprising an embedded web server, peer interface module, and host software and a plurality of linked devices comprising an interface that communicate with the peer interface module of the master control device controlled by the embedded web server in Fig. 9 as items 21 and 31. The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees. There is no peer interface module disclosed or suggested within Namma et al. The Applicant, respectfully, points out that Namma et al. clearly teach communications that takes place through the use of World Wide Web (WWW) servers and browsers (see Namma et al. col. 21, line 9-col. 22, line 22) to transfer HTML files via http communication. Communication through WWW servers and browsers to transfer HTML files via http communications is not equivalent to communication through peer to peer interface modules. To sustain a rejection based on obviousness, all the elements must be disclosed or suggested. Namma et al. is not intended to operate in the manner suggested by the modification made in the rejection.

The Examiner contends that Namma et al. teach peer interface modules. The Applicant, respectfully, points out that peer to peer file transfer does not involve the use of clients and servers as taught by the system of Namma et al. Peer to peer transfer employs nodes that simultaneously function as both clients and servers with other nodes

on the network. The Applicant does not agree with the assertions made in the Office Action. However, in an effort to move this case towards allowance, Claim 1 has been amended to define that the peer interface module form a network independent of the internet. Claim 1 is believed to be allowable.


Claims 7 and 12 have been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as discussed above regarding Claim 1. The remaining claims depend from Claim 1, 7 and 12 either directly or indirectly, and further narrow and define these claims. Therefore, the remaining claims are also believed to be allowable.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this response to Account No. 50-3745, including extension fees but excluding issue fees, and to credit any over payments to the same account.


Respectfully submitted,

By 
James D. Leimbach
Patent Attorney, Reg. No. 34,374

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted on this date via
facsimile transmission to (571) 273-8300 AND addressed to:
Mail Stop: Amendment
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: April 12, 2006

Signature: 
Person Signing: James D. Leimbach